



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1359 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 1359 of 2026

and

CMP.No.6623 of 2026

1. K.Easu

S/o.Kuppan, Res. at No.272,
Athangikavanoor Village, Uthukottai
Taluk and Tiruvallur District.

2. Captain Nove.E

S/o. E.Easu, Res. at No.272,
Athangikavanoor Village, Uthukottai
Taluk and Tiruvallur District.

3. Seemon Raja E

S/o. E.Easu, Res. at, Athangikavanoor
Village, Uthukottai Taluk and Tiruvallur
District.

4. Wisdom Samuvel

S/o. E.Easu, Res. at, Athangikavanoor
Village, Uthukottai Taluk and Tiruvallur
District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Vangibai

W/o.Late.Ganesa Mudaliar, Res. at
No.12, Thamaripakkam Village,
Velliyur Firka, Thiruvallur Taluk and
District.

2.Balu .G Alias Bala Subramanian

S/o.Late.Ganesa Mudaliar, Res. at
No.12, Thamaripakkam Village,
Velliyur Firka, Thiruvallur Taluk and



District.

3.Hariharan G

S/o.Late.Ganesa Mudaliar, Res. at
No.12, Thamaripakkam Village,
Velliyur Firka, Thiruvallur Taluk and
District.

4.Kandhan G

S/o.Late.Ganesa Mudaliar, Res. at
No.12, Thamaripakkam Village,
Velliyur Firka, Thiruvallur Taluk and
District.

5.Sasikala G

W/o. Panneerselvam, D/o.Late.Ganesa
Mudaliar, Res. at No.12,
Thamaripakkam Village, Velliyur Firka,
Thiruvallur Taluk and District.

6.Latha Alias Padmini

W/o. Yuvaraj, D/o.Late.Ganesa
Mudaliar, Res. at No.12,
Thamaripakkam Village, Velliyur Firka,
Thiruvallur Taluk and District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying
to set aside the Fair and decreetal order dated 21.11.2025 passed in IA No. 15 of
2025 in OS No. 268 of 2011 on the file of Additional District Munsif at
Tiruvallur.

For Petitioner(s): MR.J.R.K.Bhavanantham

For Respondent(s):



ORDER

The petitioners have filed this revision petition to set aside the Fair and decreetal order dated 21.11.2025 passed in IA No. 15 of 2025 in OS No. 268 of 2011 on the file of Additional District Munsif at Tiruvallur.

2. Before the trial Court, the plaintiffs filed an application in I.A. No.15 of 2025 in O.S. No.268 of 2011 to reopen the plaintiffs' evidence in order to prove the signatures found in Ex.A7 and Ex.A8. For that purpose, the plaintiffs sought to summon the Station House Officer to produce the records relating to Ex.A7, Ex.A8 and also Ex.A2. However, the said re-open application was dismissed by the learned trial Judge after hearing both sides.

3. The trial Court observed that the suit is one for declaration of title and permanent injunction based on an unregistered sale letter dated 06.05.1997 said to have been executed by the first respondent. Based on the said document, a police complaint marked as Ex.A7 came into existence, and the signature found in the complaint is now disputed. The plaintiffs therefore sought to examine the Station House Officer, but the trial Court held that calling such witness is unnecessary and unwarranted for adjudication of the issues in controversy and accordingly dismissed the petition. The Court also observed that nearly 30 years have elapsed from the alleged complaint of the year 1995 and therefore no



useful purpose would be served by summoning the Station House Officer.

Aggrieved by the same, the present revision has been filed.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the revision petitioners submitted that the signature found in Ex.A7 has been denied by the first defendant, and therefore it is necessary to summon the Station House Officer to prove the complaint and the signature found therein. The suit is one for declaration, and the parties must be given sufficient opportunity to prove their case, failing which valuable rights would be affected. Whether the witness is ultimately necessary or not can be decided during trial, but the opportunity to re-open the evidence should not be denied.

5. Considering the submissions and on perusal of the records, this Court is of the view that an opportunity ought to be given to the plaintiffs to reopen the evidence. If any document is produced, its admissibility and relevance can be decided at the time of trial. Therefore, the findings of the trial Court are set aside and the I.A No. 15 of 2025 in OS No. 268 of 2011 is allowed. The plaintiffs are directed to pay batta and cooperate for early disposal of the trial proceedings.



6. However, liberty is granted to the respondents to raise all objections, either by filing additional written statement or by adducing further evidence before the trial Court.

7. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No Costs.

18-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
rri



CRP No. 1359 of 2026



1. The Additional District Munsif at
Tiruvallur.

2. The Section Officer, VR Section,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1359 of 2026



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
rri

CRP No. 1359 of 2026

18-03-2026